



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,114	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167414.2/40062.150USU1	3950
27488	7590	02/21/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			THAI, HANH B	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			PAPER NUMBER	
			2163	
DATE MAILED: 02/21/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/014,114

Applicant(s)

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B. Thai

Art Unit

2163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment filed 12/13/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a Final Office Action in response to communication received on December 13, 2005. Independent claim 11 has been amended. Claims 1-13 are pending in this application.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's arguments filed December 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the remarks (page 5), applicant argued in substance that the examiner has failed to establish or the amended claims preclude a finding of a prima facie case of obviousness because the reference fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims (claim 1).

In response to applicant's argument that the reference fails to disclose certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the language of the limitations in claim 1 can be given broad and reasonable interpretation and claims 1-13 have been rejected using two references teaching all the claimed limitations.

Lee discloses object classes contains attribute that defines aspects of the database, and thus reads on "schema documents". Lee discloses at col. 3, lines 28-60 the "base class" contains properties in the form of object attributes and "Scope", and thus reads on a property sheet. Lee discloses the "base class", "Scope" and attribute values satisfy the requested condition to generate an object instance reads on property page originates from a first resource (software resource). Lee discloses the Resource Installation Processor generates an object instance and transmits the exchanges to which the resource to be installed and Lee further discloses the "Resource Installation Request Message" reads on the Property Page originates from a second

Art Unit: 2163

resource because it contains information about the resource to be installed (hardware resource), at the very least it holds identification information; modifying the property sheet to include the received pages; and wherein the property sheet represents the object (col.3, lines 36-60, Lee discloses updating the object data management system, sending a message of installation request and recognizing the new resources have been installed).

In the related art, Petty, on the other hand, discloses using XML document type definition in a panel definition markup language including the property sheets and the property pages (Fig.8A-E and col.8, line 60 to col.9, line64, Petty).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply property page and the property sheets to represent the object associated with the resources in Lee. The motivation to combine is suggested by Petty which discloses that use of the property sheets and property pages provide many advantages including the ability to use ubiquitous Internet protocols and easily control and manage network resources by applying XML schema document (col.5, lines 41-50, petty).

Applicant's arguments regarding a property sheet, property page, property sheet definition or property page definition (pages 6-11) have been considered but they are not persuasive.

In response, Petty clearly discloses using XML document type definition corresponding to property sheet definition or property page definition in a panel definition markup language including the property sheets and the property pages (Fig.8A-E and col.8, line 60 to col.9, line 64, Petty).

Applicant argues: "Petty also does not disclose appending property pages to a property sheet when adding new resources to a system."

In response: examiner respectfully point out that it is not claimed. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,732,362) of record in view of Petty et al. (US 6,342,907 B1) of record.

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Lee discloses in a distributed network environment having a server computer system and a plurality of managed resources, each resource maintaining a plurality of objects, a method of representing at least one of the objects comprising:

- receiving a first schema document that conforms to a property sheet definition such that the first schema document defines a property sheet (col. 2, lines 32-49 and col.3, lines 20-23, Lee);
- receiving two or more second schema documents that conform to a page definition to define a plurality of pages, wherein at least one property page originates from a first resource and at least one property page originates from a

second resource, wherein the first resource is a software resource the second resource is a hardware, and the second resource being different from the first resource (col.2, lines 32-49; col.3, lines 20-23 and lines 28-65). Lee discloses object classes contains attribute that defines aspects of the database, and thus reads on “schema documents”. Lee discloses at col. 3, lines 28-60 the “base class” contains properties in the form of object attributes and “Scope”, and thus reads on a property sheet. Lee discloses the “base class”, “Scope” and attribute values satisfy the requested condition to generate an object instance reads on property page originates from a first resource (software resource). Lee discloses the Resource Installation Processor generates an object instance and transmits the exchanges to which the resource to be installed and Lee further discloses the “Resource Installation Request Message” reads on the Property Page originates from a second resource because it contains information about the resource to be installed (hardware resource), at the very least it holds identification information;

- modifying the property sheet to include the received pages; and wherein the property sheet represents the object (col.3, lines 36-60, Lee discloses updating the object data management system, sending a message of installation request and recognizing the new resources have been installed).

Lee, however, does not explicitly disclose the a property page and a property sheet. Petty, on the other hand, discloses using XML document type definition in a panel definition markup

Art Unit: 2163

language including the property sheets and the property pages (Fig.8A-E and col.8, line 60 to col.9, line64, Petty).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply property page and the property sheets to represent the object associated with the resources in Lee. The motivation to combine is suggested by Petty which discloses that use of the property sheets and property pages provide many advantages including the ability to use ubiquitous Internet protocols and easily control and manage network resources by applying XML schema document (col.5, lines 41-50, petty).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Lee and Petty combination further discloses that the property sheet comprises object-type information applicable to objects of the same type, and wherein the property pages comprise resource-specific information (col.10, line 50 to col. 11, line 67, Petty).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Lee and Petty combination further discloses receiving a request to display information related to an instance of the object (abstract, Petty); accessing the property sheet related to the object-type of the instance of the object; displaying object-type information gleaned from the property sheet; using the property pages of the property sheet, displaying information related to resources associated with the instance of the object; and displaying received instance-specific information from the associated resources (Fig.1, Fig.3-7 and corresponding text, petty).

Regarding claim 4, Lee and Petty combination further discloses at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (col. 4, lines. 32-67, Petty).

Art Unit: 2163

Regarding claim 5, Lee and Petty combination further discloses the code relates to a search engine on the associated resource (col. 2, lines. 50-67, Lee).

Regarding claims 6 and 10, Lee and Petty combination further that the property sheet and property pages stored as XML (Fig.8A-8E, Petty).

Regarding claim 11, Lee discloses in a network environment having multiple resources, a computer program product readable by a computer and having stored thereon a data structure, comprising:

A property sheet displayable to a user on the network environment representing the object maintained by one of the multiple resources (Lee discloses at col. 3, lines 28-60 the “base class” contains properties in the form of object attributes and “Scope”, and thus reads on a property sheet. Lee discloses the “base class”, “Scope” and attribute values satisfy the requested condition to generate an object instance reads on property page associated with software resource. Lee discloses the Resource Installation Processor generates an object instance and transmits the exchanges to which the resource to be installed and Lee further discloses the “Resource Installation Request Message” reads on the Property Page associated with installed resource because it contains information about the resource to be installed, at the very least it holds identification information (hardware resource). Furthermore, the objects of Lee are in the context of a GUI (col.3, lines 5-40) and therefore displayable values is displayed to a user on the network environment).

Lee, however, does not explicitly disclose the a property page and a property sheet. Petty, on the other hand, discloses using XML document type definition in a panel definition markup

Art Unit: 2163

language including the property sheets and the property pages (Fig.8A-E and col.8, line 60 to col.9, line64, Petty).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply property page and the property sheets to represent the object associated with the resources in Lee. The motivation to combine is suggested by Petty which discloses that use of the property sheets and property pages provide many advantages including the ability to use ubiquitous Internet protocols and easily control and manage network resources by applying XML schema document (col.5, lines 41-50, petty).

Regarding claim 12, Lee and Petty combination further discloses the property sheet relates to object type information and wherein the property pages relate to resource-specific information (col. 2, lines 32-49 and col.3, lines 20-60, Lee).

Regarding claim 13, Lee/Petty combination further discloses wherein at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (“link” corresponding to “pointer”, Fig.15, Petty).

Conclusion

3. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2163

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2163

February 9, 2006


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER